

and from rural and urban areas to ensure that American agriculture remains a model of quality and efficiency for all nations.●

NOMINATION OF MERRICK GARLAND

● Mr. FAIRCLOTH. Mr. President, yesterday I voted "no" on the nomination of Merrick Garland to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit.

In so voting, I take no position on the personal qualifications of Mr. Garland to be a Federal appeals court judge. What I do take a position on is that the vacant 12th seat on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit does not need to be filled. Senator CHUCK GRASSLEY, chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on Administrative Oversight and the Courts, has examined this issue thoroughly, and has determined that the court's workload does not justify the existence of the 12th seat. Last Congress, Senator GRASSLEY introduced legislation to abolish this unneeded seat. By proceeding to renominate Mr. Garland, President Clinton has flatly ignored this uncontradicted factual record.

I commend Senator GRASSLEY for his important work on this matter, as well as Senator JEFF SESSIONS, who has also emphasized the importance of this matter. With the Federal deficit at an all time high, we should always be vigilant in looking for all opportunities to cut wasteful government spending; this is one such opportunity. After all, each unnecessary circuit judge and his or her staff cost the taxpayer at least \$1 million a year.

Lastly, our vote yesterday is an important precedent, since it marks the beginning of the Senate's new commitment to hold rollcall votes on all judicial nominees. This is a policy change which I had urged on my Republican colleagues by letter of January 8, 1997, to the Republican Conference. Voting on Federal judges, who serve for life and who exert dramatic—mostly unchecked—influence over society, should be one of the most important aspects of serving as a U.S. Senator. Rollcall votes will, I believe, impress upon the individual judge, the individual Senator, and the public the importance of just what we are voting on. I hope that my colleagues will regard this vote, and every vote they take on a Federal judge, as being among the most important votes they will ever take.●

TRIBUTE TO PROF. ROBERT J. LAMPMAN

● Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I rise to offer tribute to Dr. Robert J. Lampman, economist, University of Wisconsin-Madison professor and noted researcher on poverty, who passed away March 4 at his home in Madison.

Mr. President, Dr. Lampman spent much of his distinguished professional

career studying and writing about poverty and working to develop strategies to achieve its end. In 1966, he became the founding director of the Institute for Research on Poverty, a nonpartisan center for research into the causes and consequences of poverty and social inequality in America, on the UW-Madison campus, which established the university as a leader of research in that field. A colleague at the University of Wisconsin, Dr. Lee Hansen, called Dr. Lampman "a true scholar in that he was always asking questions to get a better understanding of the issues."

Despite his standing in his profession, Dr. Lampman was known as a professor who regarded his students as colleagues. One news report describing his career included a recollection by Dr. Thomas Corbett, once a graduate student studying with Dr. Lampman and now a University of Wisconsin professor of social work and acting director of the IRP. Dr. Corbett recalled Dr. Lampman's stopping by his office and saying he wanted "to pick my brain." "In a world where egos can become overwhelming, he was a guy who never lost his perspective," Dr. Corbett said.

In 1962, he joined the staff of President John Kennedy's Council of Economic Advisors, where he prophetically warned that economic growth, alone, would not eliminate poverty. He was later a key author of the historic chapter on poverty contained in Lyndon Johnson's "Economic Report of the President" in 1964 that helped call America's attention to poverty.

Dr. Lampman became, in the words of Nobel laureate economist James Tobin, "the intellectual architect of the War on Poverty," and he emphasized the importance of economic growth, income maintenance, and opportunities for education and jobs for those mired in poverty.

In 1964, as the War on Poverty was getting underway, he predicted to a group of University of Wisconsin-Madison graduate students that, within 20 years, "by present standards, no one will be poor."

Mr. President, it turned out that Professor Lampman was overly optimistic. Poverty was not eliminated in 20 years, but the War on Poverty had an impact. In 1964, before the War on Poverty was up and running, 19 percent of Americans were poor. Within 5 years, programs created by the Federal Government and a broadly expanding economy had combined to bring that number down to 12.1 percent. By 1973, the poverty rate was down to 11.1 percent.

That progress stalled, for many reasons. Census Bureau estimates for 1995, the most recent year for which data are available, tell us 13.8 percent of our Nation's population was poor, and, in the wealthiest nation in history, one American child in five lived in poverty.

Mr. President, Dr. Lampman's dedication, his intellectual energy, and his commitment to solving one of the most difficult, complex, and persistent social challenges we face should inform and

inspire us. We should apply, as Dr. Lampman did, our best efforts to ridding our world of the plague of poverty and finally establishing social justice. That would be the most fitting tribute we could pay to this man.●

RURAL HEALTH

● Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, I rise today to pledge my support to the Rural Health Improvement Act of 1997. In my home State of Michigan and across the Nation, this legislation would improve the standard of health care for millions of Americans who live in rural areas.

Mr. President, I am very aware of the problems inherent in caring for citizens who live far away from major cities. Too often, these hardworking taxpayers and their children are not given easy access to the quality emergency and primary care services they deserve. There have, however, been two recent efforts that have been extremely successful in providing such care while also controlling costs — the Montana Medical Assistance Facility demonstration project and the Essential Access Community Hospital and Rural Primary Care Hospital demonstration program.

Mr. President, the bill that I endorse today would extend these successful initiatives to all 50 States. It would also ease Federal regulations for small hospitals that wish to be designated as "critical access" institutions. The aim of the bill is to allow these facilities greater flexibility in tailoring their services to the needs of patients in their particular communities. In short, I believe this law would improve care and save lives. A study of these programs by the General Accounting Office, in fact, has found that these initiatives actually decreased Medicare costs while maintaining a high standard of care.

In my view, Michigan and the rest of the Nation must receive the most affordable high quality care available. I believe this legislation is an important step in that direction. For these reasons, I am proud to cosponsor this legislation and urge my colleagues to do the same.●

SAFE ADOPTIONS AND FAMILIES ENVIRONMENTS ACT

● Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I rise today to voice my strong support for the Chafee-Rockefeller Safe Adoptions and Families Environments Act [SAFE]. What's more, I commend each of them for their tireless and bipartisan efforts on behalf of this issue.

As I come to the floor today, it is difficult for me to imagine a more outrageous and disgraceful form of violence than child abuse.

However, while national attention to the problems of abuse are increasing, regrettably, so too are incidents of child abuse and neglect.

In fact, the number of abused and neglected children nearly doubled from